DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 453 PS 019 861

AUTHOR Copple, Carol
TITLE Quality Matters: Improving the Professional Development of the Early Childhood Work Force. Report Based on A Meeting Held at the Carnegie Corporation (New York, New York, November 7-8, 1990).
INSTITUTION Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 77p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Ladders; *Child Caregivers; *Child Care Occupations; Cooperative Planning; *Day Care; Demand Occupations; *Early Childhood Education; Financial Needs; Government Role; Inservice Education; *Professional Development; Staff Development; *Teacher Education; Training; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Findings from a meeting that brought together 35 U.S. experts on early childhood education are synthesized in this report on high quality early education and child care programs. The report is based on participants' responses to the following issues: (1) the state of knowledge about the effectiveness of preparation and training efforts; (2) the most important issues challenging preparation and training delivery systems; (3) ways to finance new programs; and (4) policy and program development strategies to improve early childhood preparation and training programs that the federal government, the states, and the private sector should pursue. The skyrocketing increase in child care needs nationwide is cited, and it is emphasized that quality is as important as quantity in service delivery. Specific topics addressed in the report include: supply and turnover problems; lack of adequate career ladders and differentiated staffing patterns; lack of professional and financial incentives; lack of demand for trained personnel; approaches to increasing financial incentives; strategies for tailoring training to specific needs; the importance of creating linkages between regulatory systems and of reducing fragmentation among institutions of higher education; and the urgent need for comprehensive and collaborative planning. Appended are a list of participants and the agenda for the meeting; resources for early training programs and curricula; a bibliography; and related materials. Contains 51 references. (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED341453

QUALITY MATTERS: IMPROVING THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY CHILDHOOD WORK FORCE

Report based on a meeting held
at Carnegie Corporation of New York
November 7 and 8, 1990

By Carol Copple

From time to time Carnegie Corporation holds meetings on issues of importance that may be closely related to its grant programs. Occasionally, reports of these meetings merit public dissemination.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael H. Levine

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 019861

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

FOREWORD. . . . . David A. Hamburg *i*

OVERVIEW 1

THE KNOWLEDGE BASE 3
- Knowledge about Early Childhood Training and Preparation 3
- Knowledge about the Early Childhood Work Force 5
- Knowledge about Key Elements of Effective Training 6

ADEQUACY OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS FOR TRAINING 7
- Fragmentation 8
- Supply and Turnover Problems in the Early Childhood Work force 9
  - Supply 9
  - Turnover 10
- Lack of Adequate Career Ladders and Differentiated Staffing Patterns . . 10

LACK OF INCENTIVES FOR, AND BARRIERS TO, TRAINING 11
- Lack of Incentives 11
- Barriers 12
- Lack of Demand for Trained Personnel 13

AN EFFECTIVE DELIVERY SYSTEM FOR PREPARATION AND TRAINING 14
- Ten Principles 14
  - Assure a Minimal, "Generic," Level of Basic Competence 14
  - Nurture Diversity of Training within the Field 15
  - Balance the Need for Quality with an Adequate Supply of Early Childhood Workers 15
  - Recognize Subspecialties of Knowledge and Skills within the Overall Early Childhood Domain 15
  - Foster Productive Career Ladders 16
  - Emphasize the Training of Directors, Coordinators, and Lead Teachers 16
  - Maintain Access to Jobs for Individuals of Different Cultural Groups and Income Levels 17
  - Create a Continuum of Training 17
  - Maximize Incentives and Minimize Barriers to Training 18
  - Assure Stable and Adequate Funding for Training 18
- An Integrated Unit 18

REDUCING BARRIERS TO TRAINING: SOME PROMISING STRATEGIES AND INITIATIVES 19

Financial Incentives 19
Enrolling and Retaining Trainees 20
Tailoring Training to Specific Needs 21
Strategies to Foster Career Ladders and Differentiated Staffing Patterns 21

CREATING LINKAGES BETWEEN REGULATORY SYSTEMS 22

REDUCING FRAGMENTATION ACROSS INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION 24

DEVELOPING A COHERENT, INTEGRATED TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEM FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD PERSONNEL 24

CONCLUSION 26

APPENDIX A: List of Participants and Agenda

APPENDIX B: Resources for Early Training Programs and Curricula

APPENDIX C: Bibliography

APPENDIX D: Sharon L. Kagan, A Profession Growing Up: Painting Our Think

APPENDIX E: Joan Lombardi, Financing Issues in the Preparation and Professional Development of the Early Childhood Workforce

FOREWORD

High-quality early education and child care programs are essential building blocks for healthy human development. According to available research, high-quality programs offer developmentally appropriate activities, have low staff-to-child ratios and group size, and employ staff members who receive ongoing training in effective early childhood education practices and child development. These features are especially important for children from disadvantaged families, who benefit from the intensive attention they receive in smaller classes and from their nurturing by expertly trained caregivers.

Early child care, preschool education, and early elementary education are currently viewed and organized as separate fields, with distinct preparation and training paths, financing, and staffing patterns. They lack the career development incentives, such as better compensation and professional recognition, that lead to a more stable work force. Higher education, professional certification institutions, and community organizations have not coordinated their training programs. The current preparation "system" is not a system at all but a hodgepodge of discrete training opportunities that do not lead individuals toward progressively higher levels of career development.

Thus, there are insufficient numbers of teachers with appropriate, specific, early childhood training to fill the current positions available in early childhood programs, including child care centers, Head Start programs, public and private preschools, and primary grade classrooms. Sadly, the current state of early childhood education is one in which many staff persons placed in charge of children are without requisite knowledge about good practice. The consequences can be deeply disturbing.

The following summary report, prepared by Carol Copple, a consultant specializing in early childhood issues, provides a synthesis of the findings from a meeting held to discuss these matters at Carnegie Corporation on November 7 and 8, 1990. Cosponsored by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the meeting called together thirty-five of the nation's leading experts on early childhood education, each of whom

prepared a brief statement on different aspects of program quality. Lilian Katz of the University of Illinois, Barbara Bowman of the Erikson Institute for Child Development, and David Weikart of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, prepared synthesis papers and led the discussions. The report draws on several other resources as well, for those interested in following up on the concerns raised. Appended are two papers, one by Sharon Lynn Kagan of Yale University describing a long-term strategy to reform the training system; the other by Joan Lombardi, an early childhood education expert, addressing financing issues that policymakers must consider. A resource list describing several well-regarded curricular and training efforts already established also appears as Appendix B.

Michael Levine, program officer, program on Education and Healthy Development of Children and Youth, was instrumental in organizing this meeting. It is our hope that this report will be stimulating and helpful to those who care about the future of our children.

David A. Hamburg
President
Carnegie Corporation of New York

QUALITY MATTERS: IMPROVING THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY CHILDHOOD WORK FORCE

Report based on a meeting held
at Carnegie Corporation of New York
November 7 and 8, 1990

OVERVIEW

Child care needs are skyrocketing in the United States, driven by the massive movement of women into the work force and the alarming numbers of children growing up in poverty. The worsening situation for families and children has intensified public interest in the research evidence that early intervention can produce positive, long-term outcomes for low-income children. Demand for more and better early childhood services is growing among business and community leaders, policymakers, public school educators, and families.

With this groundswell of demand and support, new funding has been allocated for services for young children and their families through recent federal legislation, including the expansion of Head Start, the Family Support Act, and the child care and development block grant. Over two-thirds of the states now fund pilot or statewide prekindergarten programs, most of which are school based, for at-risk or low-income children. In the for-profit sector, record numbers of child care facilities have been opened.

As early childhood services grow rapidly, it is essential to address not only the quantity but also the quality of these services. Studies show that low-income children enrolled in high-quality early childhood programs go on to experience increased school achievement, higher test scores, more successful employment, reduced delinquency, and reduced need for special services as compared with children from similar backgrounds who did not attend preschool. Moreover, children receiving high-quality care have been found to have better language and social skills, to spend less time wandering aimlessly, and to have fewer problems communicating with their teachers.

Decades of research have documented that the ability of teachers to deal successfully with children is associated with a high level of formal education and with specialized training in early childhood. The intellectual and social development of children is enhanced when teachers talk to them, ask them questions, and encourage them to express themselves. Children with such teachers appear to be more task oriented and intellectually able.

The present preparation of staff, however, is piecemeal, poorly financed, inaccessible to many, and lacking in continuity across settings and age spans (as described in subsequent sections of this report). Given the mounting need for trained personnel, the capacity of existing systems will soon be totally overwhelmed.

On the positive side, the time is ripe for reform. Expanded federal, state, and local funding of early education and care programs are increasing opportunities for improving, and possibly redesigning, elements of the preparation and training system. Public concern about the quality of early childhood programs may also promote changes. First came the national recognition that far more child care is needed. Now emerging is an awareness that ensuring the quality of services is critically important. This awareness is well expressed in the Committee for Economic Development's 1987 report, Children in Need: "Quality education is not an expense; it is an investment in the future of our nation. . . . Failure to educate is the true expense—for both society and individuals."

The need and opportunity to improve early childhood personnel training should prompt those concerned with young children's education and development to draw together and think carefully about what changes are indicated and what kinds of action will bring them about. Rigorous thinking and concerted action are essential.

With these concerns in mind, Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund brought together thirty-five of the nation's top experts in the child care and early education care field, foundation representatives, and key government leaders for a meeting, held on November 7 and 8, 1990, at the Corporation's offices. The central purposes of the meeting were: 1) to explore the components of an effective, broad-scale, early childhood education preparation and

training system that would increase the numbers being trained and also improve quality, access, and continuity of training, and 2) to devise long- and short-term strategies for bringing this system about.

The participants were asked to prepare responses to the following questions prior to the meeting:

- What is the state of our knowledge regarding the effectiveness of preparation and training efforts in the child care and early education field?
- What are the most important issues challenging the existing preparation and training delivery systems? How will new programs be financed?
- What specific policy and program development strategies should the federal government, the states, and the private sector pursue that will improve early childhood preparation and training systems?

Their responses, coupled with the discussion, provided the basis for this report.

THE KNOWLEDGE BASE

In considering strategic action to improve early childhood preparation and training systems, participants discussed the adequacy of the existing knowledge base. Is there sufficient information to determine the appropriate content of teacher preparation and training programs? What is known about current providers and how they acquire training? Finally, what is known about the elements of effective training?

Knowledge about Early Childhood Training and Preparation

Within the field of early childhood education, there is strong consensus, at least in broad terms, about the nature of developmentally appropriate environments for children eight and under. Most early childhood professionals would agree that young children learn most effectively through "a concrete play-oriented approach," as stated in the National Association for the Education of Young Children's (NAEYC)

description of developmentally appropriate practice.[1]

Wide agreement is also evident—again, in general terms—on what early childhood staff should know how to do. The following competencies from the Child Development Associate (CDA) standards,[2] would probably appear on most early childhood professionals' lists as skills necessary in working with young children:

- to establish and maintain a safe, healthy learning environment;
- to advance physical and intellectual competence;
- to support social and emotional development and provide positive guidance;
- to establish positive and productive relationships with families;
- to ensure a well-run, purposeful program responsive to participant needs;
- to maintain a commitment to professionalism.

There is broad consensus that program directors would benefit from training in 1) program development and maintenance (e.g., philosophy and goals, policies and procedures, community relations); 2) program implementation (e.g., fiscal management, record keeping, time management, decision making, planning and

---

[1] The description appears in NAEYC's 1982 report, Early Childhood Teacher Education Guidelines for Four- and Five-Year Programs.

[2] The CDA (Child Development Associate) program was started in 1971 by the U.S. Office of Child Development, now the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families. With rapid growth in early childhood programs, particularly Head Start, came the need for competent staff to deliver these programs. A task force was convened to examine the possibility of establishing a national credential for early childhood staff. It recommended a system that would "identify basic competencies (or skills) needed by staff to provide competent care; provide training for caregivers in these competencies; and evaluate the work of caregivers on the basis of these national standards and recognize them with a national 'credential' or award" (CDA National Credentialing Program, 1988, p. 41). The competency areas were developed through extensive field testing and with the input of task forces and more than 1,000 early childhood practitioners.

communication); 3) staffing, including recruitment and hiring, supervision, staff development, and staff relations; 4) dealing with parents and families; and 5) evaluation.

There is further wide agreement that, for some groups, training curricula of sufficient quality are already available within the field, although they are not as widely known or used as they could be.[3] Where such curricula exist, they could be adapted to the needs of particular groups and training purposes.

Consensus is lacking, however, on the minimum levels of knowledge and competence that early childhood personnel with varying responsibilities require in order to be effective. The early childhood field is even less decided on how to translate specified levels of competence and knowledge into a career development ladder.

Among the emerging needs that this country is not presently equipped to meet, according to meeting participants, is the development of appropriate multilingual/multicultural materials and teaching strategies. More curriculum development is needed to help providers deal with special groups, such as homeless children, children with AIDS and drug-related problems, and children who are not native speakers of English.

Apart from these new and relatively uncharted territories, the field of early childhood education has a fairly solid base of knowledge about young children and how to care for and educate them effectively. As for the content of training, then, authorities already have much of what they need; the major problems with preparation and training systems lie elsewhere.

Knowledge about the Early Childhood Work Force

Effective plans for improving the competence of the expanding early childhood work force require knowledge about those currently in the system. Two fundamental

---

[3] See Appendix B: Resources for Early Childhood Training Programs and Curricula.

questions arise: Who works with young children, and what kinds and levels of training are they now receiving?

With the 1989 National Child Care Staffing Study and the new Profiles of Child Care Settings study, it is possible to estimate the number of child care providers in the regulated child care system and characterize some aspects of their preparation and training. For the nonregulated child care system—in-home providers and nannies, unregistered or unlicensed family child care providers, and relatives—information is incomplete and difficult to obtain. With respect to these settings, very little is known about the effects on the development of children, the range of provider characteristics and practices, or the attitudes of providers toward training. Yet these nonregulated providers comprise the largest proportion of child care personnel.

Research indicates that individuals enter the early childhood field from two principal directions. One group enters through formal two- and four-year college programs. Typically, these students follow the traditional path of general and professional education courses and a brief internship, after which they find employment. For the other group, the impetus to enter training comes through employment in early childhood programs, often as a condition of the job. (For instance, Head Start supports the CDA credentialing system for continued employment.) Many programs, however, require little if any additional training.

Knowledge of the level of providers' preparation and ongoing training is far from complete, even for center-based care. According to the staffing study, 38 percent of center staff have had no training related to early childhood education. Limited information is available on the length, location, or quality of the training for those who do undergo such training.

Knowledge about Key Elements of Effective Training

Meeting participants stressed that effective training is always tailored to the needs of those who are being trained and to the demands of their work setting, and thus it is difficult to make many generalizations about the methods that will be most effective. Nonetheless, a few principles or key elements characterize effective training.

Effective training, whether it is preservice or in-service, is coherent and cumulative rather than a collection of isolated one-shot sessions that do not build one upon the other. It is based on respect for the strengths of participants as well as on a realistic assessment of their needs. A key component is supervised practice with relevant age groups.

Not enough is known about the most appropriate or effective timing, duration, or settings for supervised practice, however. The Child Development Associate program, for example, demands that 50 percent or more of a trainee's total training be spent in supervised field work. The National Association for the Education of Young Children guidelines for early childhood teacher education programs propose a minimum of 150 hours spent in each of two different settings, serving children of two different age groups.

It would be useful to know more about the character, quality, and implementation of programs, and about the relative effectiveness of different program patterns and structures. More research is called for on the interaction of training and work setting. With many providers moving across work environments, it would also be useful to investigate what types of child-related training are most easily transferred. And more must be known about how much, and what kinds, of training are needed to produce adequate competence levels for specific kinds of jobs.

Though additional knowledge in these areas would provide useful guidance for refining training methods and determining reasonable standards, participants agreed that enough is known now about effective training to allow it to proceed. In other words, the present unevenness in training experiences does not result primarily from lack of knowledge about what makes effective training, but from inadequate delivery systems and funding, as the next section explores.

ADEQUACY OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS FOR TRAINING

The early childhood field is diverse in its professional roles, populations served, and program auspices. Early childhood practitioners can be found in public schools, child care centers, Head Start programs, family child care homes, nursery schools, and a

variety of other settings. In addition to working directly with young children, early childhood professionals can function as home visitors, health care personnel, child and family advocates, and parent educators, among other roles relating to young children. Although many early childhood practitioners work with children three and over, a growing number care for infants and toddlers. Some work with developmentally disabled children, bilingual children, children of migrant workers, gifted children, or other children with special needs. This wide diversity has a number of important effects on training.

Fragmentation

Because the early childhood field is so diverse, the system for preparing and training personnel is highly fragmented.

At present, training is delivered principally by two- and four-year colleges (in a variety of departments, including child development, education, home economics, health, and social work), professional organizations, private and not-for-profit training organizations, and Head Start. Different professional communities recognize different professional credentials. Support for preparation and training, as well as services for young children, derives from a variety of funding streams, which further contributes to fragmentation.

Because training is not coordinated among institutions and because requirements for graduates vary from program to program, course credits earned in one institution or system frequently are not recognized by another. When credits cannot be transferred, sequential coursework is undermined, and students may be discouraged from pursuing further training. Preservice training is rarely coordinated with in-service training. The fragmentation in training systems also impedes job mobility, making it difficult for workers to move from a job in one system to a job in another.

Regulation is also a problem. State agencies are the most influential setters of standards, because their regulatory systems are backed up by legal enforcement. But a dichotomy exists in the division of responsibility between state agencies: State departments of education set standards for certification of teachers for public schools,

and state social service agencies or health departments establish standards for personnel in child care centers and preschools. This dual system is being challenged, but it continues to constitute a barrier to improving the status, compensation, and training of early childhood personnel. To aggravate the problem further, standards within both systems vary among different states.

Diversity also dominates state licensing requirements for child care personnel. For those in charge of a group of children, state standards range from California's requirement of twelve credits of early childhood or child development courses to Alabama's minimal regulation that the individual be sixteen years old and able to read and write. Half the states do not require any preservice training or education before individuals may be employed as teachers/caregivers in charge of a classroom, and only about a quarter require more than ten hours of in-service training a year. By and large, licensing regulations are not a positive force, as they could be, for reducing discontinuities and disparities in training or for upgrading staff through training.

Supply and Turnover Problems in the Early Childhood Work force

Any field or occupation suffers if too few qualified people are available for employment and if too many individuals leave the field. The quality of early childhood programs is severely eroded by the "double whammy" of limited supply and high turnover.

Supply. Women in the past had fewer employment options than they do now, and many were willing to work with young children at low levels of compensation. In effect, they were subsidizing early childhood programs. But as women's career choices have broadened, this source of inexpensive staff has dwindled, while the demand for child care and education has grown. Subsidized entry-level training opportunities, once prevalent and attractive incentives for low-income individuals to enter the field, have diminished.

With the demand for personnel greatly exceeding supply, it is difficult to upgrade qualification standards, or even to maintain existing standards. To fill early childhood

jobs, centers in some areas are already "taking people off the streets" with no prior qualifications at all.

Turnover. A continual influx of new, untrained personnel flows into early childhood jobs. Five years is the average career for a center-based provider and three years for a family child care provider, according to recent studies. Clearly, many providers receive training—at a cost to the system—and move on, to be replaced by individuals with less training and experience.

Many workers in the early childhood field lack a developed sense of professional identity. Often entering their first early childhood jobs with little coherent training, and subsequently receiving only scattered training experiences, individuals do not develop the investment and sense of identity enjoyed by most professionals. Lacking strong roots in the early childhood field, many move on readily as other opportunities arise. Others remain committed but cannot afford to stay. When early childhood personnel leave, whatever the reasons, the impact of their training is lost.

If high turnover poses problems for the training system, it also reflects other ills in the early childhood field. Certainly poor compensation and the lack of viable career ladders are prime causes of turnover.

Lack of Adequate Career Ladders and Differentiated Staffing Patterns

Well-defined and consistent career ladders for early childhood personnel are badly needed. Without clear articulation of staff positions across systems, accompanied by a defined set of qualifications for each, an individual has trouble advancing in the field or moving from one system to another. One example is the difficulty faced in moving from a child care center to a public school. Limited mobility, in turn, hampers recruitment and retention in the field. Meeting participants stressed the importance of mapping out career paths for those entering the field with different kinds and levels of training, including high school graduates who have taken a child development class or two, CDAs, community college graduates, and third-year college students.

Differentiated staffing patterns are beneficial, not only in developing career

ladders but also in improving access to employment and the overall quality of programs. For instance, the aide position allows individuals without formal early childhood preparation to gain access to early childhood jobs and, later, to assume responsibility for a group of children after they have had appropriate training and experience.

Career ladders, however, may draw more experienced teachers away from the classroom to administrative or supervisory roles with higher salaries and status. This problem can be addressed by finding ways to reward teaching excellence without removing teachers from the classroom. One promising solution would be the wider use of experienced teachers in training.

A system with these problems wastes the time, effort, and resources of trainees, squanders limited training resources, and reduces the quality of early childhood care and education. Moreover, fragmentation of delivery systems presents a major obstacle to improvement. Creating substantial, widespread, and integrated improvements in training will be far more difficult, participants acknowledged, because the players involved in preparation and training enterprises are so various.

LACK OF INCENTIVES FOR, AND BARRIERS TO, TRAINING

The present system fails to make training attractive and feasible for providers, according to the meeting participants.

Lack of Incentives

Regulatory requirements (through professional credentialing and/or state regulations) and compensation are the two major kinds of incentives that drive training in most fields. Both are inadequate in the early childhood field.

Regulatory incentives for training are uneven across the states and are minimal in most. More than half the states do not require any preservice education or training for child care workers, and only about a quarter require more than ten hours of in-service annually. In the kindergarten-through-twelfth-grade teaching profession, regulation by state education agencies (via teaching certification procedures and

accreditation of higher education institutions) is strong and is widely regarded as a primary force driving the system of teacher preparation and in-service professional development, along with increased compensation for additional coursework and degrees. To employ a comparable force in child care, the regulating systems of Head Start, state and local child care regulatory codes and the agencies enforcing them, and state education agencies would have to be addressed.

The overall level of compensation is low for providers of early childhood services. Many individuals work nearly at minimum wage and sometimes on a less-than-full-time basis, which allows employers to avoid the cost of employee benefits. Low pay militates against improved training in a number of ways. It affects recruitment to the field, it stimulates rapid turnover, and it discourages extensive preservice training. Low pay also stimulates rapid turnover.

Little direct compensation is offered for additional training. Directors of early childhood programs are reluctant to pay higher salaries for higher qualifications, and independent family child care providers seldom charge higher fees after training. If they did, they might lose business. Parents typically do not choose providers on the basis of education and are often unwilling to pay more when a provider does attain more training.

Barriers

Apart from the lack of incentives, numerous obstacles make training difficult and daunting to early childhood staff. The following barriers were cited by participants:

- The cost of classes discourages providers, many of whom are low income, from attending training. In the absence of funds for released time, staff members may also have to forfeit pay in order to attend training. Few will be willing to bear these costs unless they see clear advantages, such as career or salary advancement. Some would not be able to pay even if they saw training as highly attractive in every other sense.

- The time and energy to pursue training are in short supply for providers. Many work long days, have families of their own, and are apt to find getting to a class to be one deterrent too many. They may face the

additional problem of returning safely after dark.

- Fear or lack of self-confidence are major deterrents to training. Many providers have had poor educational preparation and negative experiences with school. Often they are not comfortable in college classrooms or confident of their own ability to learn.

- Irrelevant or low-quality training, all too common in the early childhood field, does not attract providers to training experiences or motivate them to persist.

As the section beginning on page 18 will describe, thoughtful efforts to address these barriers and provide effective incentives have met with considerable success. But when these issues are ignored, as they typically are, participation in training will be limited.

Lack of Demand for Trained Personnel

A final and crucial piece of the early childhood training picture is the lack of "consumer demand" for well-qualified personnel. Without this, it will be difficult to remedy the many ills in the system.

Provider preparation and training do not appear to weigh heavily on parents' child care choices, research suggests, although parents claim to value "quality." Parents sometimes are not aware of factors that have been found to influence quality, such as group size and staff/child ratio. And maternal satisfaction is not consistently related to whether or not providers are trained.

Until parents place more value on provider training, market influences on training delivery systems will be out of kilter. Center directors and family child care providers respond to parental demand, whether it emphasizes well-qualified staff or focuses mainly on low fees and convenience. For parents to begin demanding a better-qualified work force, they will have to see the relationship between well-prepared and well-compensated teachers and the quality of early childhood services.

A scenario of market influences favorable for well-qualified early childhood

personnel would include parents and center directors demanding appropriately trained teachers, regulatory systems requiring such preparation, and providers receiving sufficient compensation to justify appropriate training. At present, market influences are not operating in this way.

In sum, today's system of early childhood preparation and training is characterized by fragmentation, a shortage of qualified personnel, high turnover, inadequate career ladders, too many barriers and too few incentives for training, and a lack of consumer demand for well-trained personnel. Clearly, these problems are closely intertwined, and all will have to be addressed.

AN EFFECTIVE DELIVERY SYSTEM FOR PREPARATION AND TRAINING

Having identified the major problems in the existing delivery systems for preparation and training, participants described ten principles that are critical to an effective delivery system:

Ten Principles

1) Assure a Minimal, "Generic," Level of Basic Competence. Participants agreed that a basic level of knowledge and skills is essential to early childhood jobs. Maintaining the access of low-income and minority individuals to early childhood employment, as well as the realities of personnel supply, suggests that some workers will be hired without this basic competence. But there must be a commitment to ensuring that all receive the necessary training as promptly as possible. Moreover, no one should be responsible for a group of children until a minimal level of competence is attained. If the generic competence base is not to be acquired through a single course or uniform set of courses provided by a central system, criteria will be needed for determining who possesses this requisite knowledge base and who does not. Perhaps at least one basic course will be required of all, as is currently the case in some states, such as Florida. A competency-based approach like CDA could be

used to determine whether individuals have the basic level of knowledge deemed necessary.

2) Nurture Diversity of Training within the Field. The diversity of training required to address the multiple issues in the early childhood field poses challenges, but it also offers strengths, not the least of which is the richness of multidisciplinary perspectives. With training resources in short supply—expertise and time as well as money—all existing systems (community-, university-, and private-sector-initiated) will be needed to provide preparation and training for the expanding work force.

3) Balance the Need for Quality with an Adequate Supply of Early Childhood Workers. A fundamental tension between quality and quantity was broached periodically throughout the discussions of preparation and training. The participants agreed that they would like to see standards of early childhood preparation raised. Yet they asserted that, with increased demand and the difficulties of recruitment and retention (from low pay and other factors), instituting prerequisite qualifications for all early childhood jobs would not be possible.

To balance quality and quantity, the general approach favored by participants involves differentiated staffing patterns that place less-qualified staff in positions in which they can learn from more experienced, better-trained staff, along with a strong program of in-service training. Long-term changes, such as improved compensation and career ladders, could bring worker supply more in line with demand, increase the professionalism of the early childhood field, and reinforce a range of delivery system improvements that would enhance the quality of preparation and training.

4) Recognize Subspecialties of Knowledge and Skills within the Overall Early Childhood Domain. Providers who work with infants and toddlers need different knowledge and skills from those who work with four- to eight-year-olds. Those who work with developmentally disabled children, gifted children, bilingual children, or other groups with distinctive needs require preparation and training suited to these

needs. Home visitors and parent educators need different training from that of center-based teachers or family child care providers. Likewise, operating one's own family child care business demands skills different from those needed for working within a structure like a public school.

The participants did not see a range of distinct and separate credentials, each with its own route to qualification, as the most appropriate approach. Rather, they recommended an overarching early childhood training that would encompass subspecialties such as infants and toddlers or parent education. In this view, all early childhood professionals would share certain basic knowledge and values about children and families, and beyond these they would have specialized knowledge of various kinds.

5) Foster Productive Career Ladders. The early childhood field needs credible career ladders in which increased compensation is correlated with educational preparation, years of experience, and higher competence. Such career ladders are important in attracting and retaining individuals to the field and breaking down the fragmentation between early childhood programs. In early childhood, the development of career ladders is in its infancy. The NAEYC draft model of early childhood professional development provides a useful point of departure for this development.

6) Emphasize the Training of Directors, Coordinators, and Lead Teachers. Competent, well-qualified directors are conducive to good early childhood programs, the evidence suggests. The NAEYC has found that the best predictor of success in the accreditation process is a strong director with an early childhood background. As indicated, many people come into the system with little preparation. Their most important training—sometimes their only training—is the experience and mentoring they receive on the job. Therefore, directors, coordinators, and lead teachers are pivotal in improving the quality of early childhood staff. With limited resources, it seems strategic to focus on the in-service training and preservice preparation of lead

teachers, directors, and coordinators and especially on teaching them how to teach and mentor others.

7) Maintain Access to Jobs for Individuals of Different Cultural Groups and Income Levels. In pushing for a more qualified early childhood work force, it is important not to reduce the access of individuals from low-income and minority backgrounds to jobs and advanced training. Participants argued against imposing conventional higher education requirements that would essentially foreclose advanced training opportunities for mature individuals from low-income and minority backgrounds.

The answer seems to lie in a strong in-service training system that provides coherent training, not a scattered hodgepodge of one-shot workshops. Because individuals may not stay long in early childhood employment, training should be designed to have the most immediate and direct impact on the quality of child care, focusing first on the aspects providers can apply immediately to their work with children. Training should be sensitive to differences of race, class, and ethnicity and should draw on the trainees' own culture and life experience. As one participant said, "We don't want to trade off access for quality, but [with appropriate in-service training] we don't have to."

8) Create a Continuum of Training. The training of early childhood personnel should be seen as cumulative and ongoing throughout the individual's career. The image of a career "escalator" was suggested by one participant as descriptive of staff development in child care programs. With new people entering and leaving at different "floors," continuously and unpredictably, a model that calls for years of preparation followed by years of work to recoup the upfront investment is not appropriate for the field as a whole, participants agreed. Even when individuals have considerable preservice preparation or other advanced training, they will continue to need additional training as new knowledge and needs emerge in the field.

9) Maximize Incentives and Minimize Barriers to Training. Regulatory systems could require higher levels of training, preservice or in-service or both. Financial incentives for more training should be potent motivators.

Certain incentives will be important with some groups and not with others. Family child care providers, for example, particularly new providers, want help with record keeping and preparing taxes. The opportunity to network and socialize with colleagues is another incentive to participate in training that is especially appealing to family child care providers, who tend to be rather isolated. Participation in training may be promoted by strategies that build on this incentive, such as provider associations, that encourage members to participate.

As for reducing barriers, it is important to tailor training to providers' logistical needs. It is particularly effective to establish and maintain one-to-one contact with providers, encouraging them to attend training, addressing the barriers that are operating for each individual, and following up by telephone or other means.

10) Assure Stable and Adequate Funding for Training. While increases in funds available for training are emerging (see Appendix E), comparatively speaking few dollars are dedicated to training in general and fewer yet to improving the training delivery system. Training budgets, participants lamented, are usually the first to go when cutbacks are made. The kinds of sustained growth and upgrading that are needed in preparation and training of the early childhood work force can occur only if there is stable, long-term funding. To avoid having to negotiate for funding with each new budget allocation or grant, the goal is to earmark a certain percentage of all early childhood funding for personnel preparation and training.

An Integrated Unit

These principles are not independent but are closely bound together. When any one of them is violated, it is difficult for the others to be maintained. When these principles are followed, meeting participants asserted, they will operate synergistically to multiply positive effects on preparation and training. In planning strategies to

achieve an effective system for personnel preparation and training, therefore, it is critical to embrace these essential principles not one or two at a time but as a coherent and integrated set. **The emphatic message of the meeting was that to achieve an adequate system for training and preparation of early childhood personnel, the U.S. needs more than a few repairs to its present system. It needs a comprehensive and integrated reshaping of the entire system that is in alignment with these ten key principles.**

REDUCING BARRIERS TO TRAINING: SOME PROMISING STRATEGIES AND INITIATIVES

Some promising efforts to improve the training of early childhood caregivers are already under way. These efforts show that while the problems with early childhood personnel training are serious, they are not beyond the reach of constructive and innovative action. It should be emphasized, however, that the following strategies and initiatives, though encouraging, are far from sufficient. To achieve changes of significant scope, members of the early childhood community must develop a wider range of innovative strategies in conjunction with business leaders, policymakers, and communities. They must also initiate more rigorous and systematic planning. It is hoped that the ideas and strategies described here will help spark such a process.

The most effective strategies and initiatives for improving training often address several related problems at once and incorporate more than one of the principles described in the previous section. For organizational purposes, however, this section will describe strategies under several broad headings.

Financial Incentives

Some programs to increase the financial rewards for improved child care training have been initiated by state governments and philanthropic organizations. For instance, Minnesota pays more for care in NAEYC-accredited centers, which must have well-qualified staff. A few states, including Maryland, Virginia, and Minnesota, have also established loan forgiveness and scholarship programs for early childhood

staff. With funds from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Greater Triangle Community Foundation, and the Woodson Foundation, a North Carolina agency supports 80 percent of early childhood trainees' tuition at local community colleges. The student and the employer contribute 10 percent each. Students receive a 5 percent merit pay increase on completion of six courses and must agree to continue working in the program for another year.

Training programs can also help child care providers themselves, to increase compensation. Workshops, usually developed by local community colleges and resource and referral agencies, train providers about raising fees and implementing sliding fee scales, or about more basic issues such as receiving payment on time, collecting fees in advance, charging parents extra for picking up children late, and taking paid vacations.

Enrolling and Retaining Trainees

Providers often need to be convinced to attend and complete training programs. One-to-one contact between staff members and both potential and enrolled trainees has contributed to the high completion rates in the Family-to-Family training project, which was launched in 1988 by the Dayton Hudson Foundation and was replicated by Target Stores in 1990 (funding projects in thirty-two communities over seven years). The program of personal contact, which includes a combination of personal outreach, telephone follow-up, home visits, and mentoring programs, has proven effective in encouraging providers to try and complete training.

Training participation can also be fostered by starting or strengthening provider associations and support groups, according to the experience of the Family-to-Family project and Child Care, Inc., a resource and referral agency in New York City. Personal contact and peer support are especially important in encouraging low-income individuals to become qualified members of the early childhood work force. Child Care, Inc. recruits public assistance recipients into a child-care teacher/internship program, sets up their internship assignments, assists them in registering for college and applying for financial aid and child care, provides them

with ongoing counseling and support groups, and gives them a small stipend.

To overcome the difficulty of obtaining released time to attend training, a city-wide public/private partnership in Rochester, New York, is facilitating and paying for released time by use of a cadre of substitute teachers—a "flying squad"—to fill in while staff members attend training.

Tailoring Training to Specific Needs

The importance of tailoring training to local providers' needs has been illustrated again and again in community efforts. National and statewide efforts to promote training and preparation should not lose sight of the importance of customizing both content and logistics to the specific circumstances of each group of trainees.

As these examples demonstrate, some efforts are already being made to reduce the barriers and increase the incentives for participating in training. Implementing such actions jointly, rather than one or two at a time, will maximize their effectiveness in increasing the participation of the early childhood work force in training.

Strategies to Foster Career Ladders and Differentiated Staffing Patterns

Throughout the meeting, participants stressed the importance of developing viable career ladders and differentiated staffing patterns—that is, a variety of different positions within a given child care setting (e.g., director, master teacher/mentor, teacher, and assistant teacher). In such a differentiated staffing pattern, each staff category has certain responsibilities and a corresponding level of compensation, and the level and type of training vary with the position.

A number of states have incorporated the concept of career ladders into their staff qualification requirements. Eleven states specify two levels of caregiving in their licensing requirements for early childhood programs. Each child care program must retain at least one "lead teacher" to act as a role model or mentor for other teachers. This system provides the bare beginnings of a career ladder.

In a more highly developed career approach, Massachusetts grants licensing

certification to staff members as teacher, lead teacher, director of a small center, or director of a large center. The state department of education recognizes an associate teacher title, and new reforms propose other potential roles, such as provisional teacher and mentor.

Delaware's comprehensive plan for training suggests that the required ongoing (in-service) training be developed in relation to a career approach, recognizing three levels in both the center and family child care systems: apprentice, competent practitioner, and master practitioner.

Using skilled classroom teachers as mentors serves at least two important purposes, participants suggested. First, this approach expands and improves training opportunities for teachers and assistant teachers new to the child care field. Second, it offers experienced and skilled teachers a way of moving up a career ladder without moving out of the classroom.

Not every teacher who is highly skilled in working with young children is automatically a good mentor. To address that issue, a mentor teacher program has been established in California under the joint sponsorship of the Child Care Employee Project and Chabot College Early Childhood Development Department. The program offers prospective mentors a course in "Classroom Personnel Supervision," which is a prerequisite to serving as a mentor in the state child care programs. The course provides a forum for discussing issues in the supervision of assistant teachers and aides, as well as the special problems associated with supervising staff in a high turnover situation. Helping skilled teachers to become effective mentors is an economical method of providing enhanced training for future generations of teachers.

CREATING LINKAGES BETWEEN REGULATORY SYSTEMS

Connecting the various regulatory systems in the area of staff qualifications is one means of unifying the early childhood work force. It could also help extend training opportunities throughout the work force.

An instructive example is offered by states whose prekindergarten programs use

settings other than public schools. In creating new standards specific to its prekindergarten program, a state has available at least four regulatory systems that can be used alone or in combination: the school code, Head Start standards, the day care regulatory code, and day care purchase-of-service standards. Those states that have created prekindergarten programs specifically modeled on Head Start and are using local Head Start agencies to operate them have relied heavily on the Head Start Performance Standards (e.g., New Jersey and Oregon). Others are using day care licensing standards alone or in combination (e.g., California, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, and Vermont). Florida and Illinois attempted to incorporate elements of child care standards in their prekindergarten standards, thus creating career ladders of a sort.

In Florida, staff education and ongoing training requirements overlap among the various state-funded programs. The department of public instruction (DPI) requires all staff members in the state-funded prekindergarten program to complete the twenty-hour introductory child care training course or the equivalent required for child care workers by the state day care licensing agency. Teachers in the prekindergarten programs must have a CDA or the equivalent, which is also one of three options for qualification as a teacher under day care licensing. Each of the systems, education and child care, has a career ladder, and the ladders intersect at two points: the same introductory course is required in both, and the same degree (CDA or equivalent) qualifies individuals to work with the position.

Another perspective on reconciling regulatory differences was provided by the state of Illinois, which offered caregivers two options to qualify to teach in its state-funded prekindergarten program. They could either meet the requirements of the day care code (i.e., qualifications for day care center supervisor) or hold an early childhood certificate issued under the school code. This experiment did not last beyond one year owing due to a variety of implementation obstacles, but it provides a model for cross-referencing two systems. Other approaches to incorporating state licensing standards into teacher certification requirements should be explored.

REDUCING FRAGMENTATION ACROSS INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The training delivery system could be improved, participants suggested, if institutions of higher education in a city or region collaborated and coordinated their efforts. They could cooperate to improve the appropriateness and coverage of course and program offerings, expand access, and reduce barriers, particularly the nontransferability of courses, which deter students from pursuing training.

A promising effort, still in the early stages, is the Higher Education Compact of colleges in eastern Massachusetts, including colleges that are two- and four-year, private and public, inner-city and suburban, large and small. The compact will develop a model for joint accreditation of community-based training offerings and continue to identify and work toward removing barriers to career development among member colleges.

Cross-institutional cooperative efforts of this kind are badly needed and could be encouraged by incentive grants from foundations, states, or the federal government.

DEVELOPING A COHERENT, INTEGRATED TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEM FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD PERSONNEL

The urgent need for comprehensive and collaborative planning was reiterated throughout the meeting. Lynn Kagan offers one suggestion for ways the early childhood field might structure such planning in Appendix A.

A potentially useful model for development of services for young children, participants suggested, is the highly successful national effort to develop services for preschool handicapped children. In the early 1970s, the federal government began the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program to develop a base from which a comprehensive program of services for young handicapped children could be launched. The idea was to create an infrastructure to support a major expansion of services for preschool handicapped children, not unlike the expansion now under way in early childhood services.

Three components of that infrastructure are of particular interest. First, a

nationwide network of demonstration programs was established to present models of effective services at the local level. Over the years several hundred of these model programs have been funded. Besides serving as models, they have bred a network of dedicated and well-trained professionals to lead the field. Second, the U.S. government funded a network of support programs for early childhood special educators. A national technical assistance center was established to work with members of the demonstration programs. Finally, training grants were provided to support the work of teacher trainers and to attract young people into the field.

The infrastructure of that system, as well as the concept of a significant federal role in strengthening the capacity of states and localities to provide services, could be replicated. Participants discussed the possibility of implementing a state-based training system with federal incentive grants for states to create model programs that included training. These might provide incentives, for instance, for creation of early childhood units (for children four to eight) in schools. These units would provide training for early childhood teachers, including the retraining of public school teachers in developmentally appropriate practice for this age group.

In Delaware, a model for a comprehensive training system has already been designed for the entire state. A consulting team of experts in early childhood preparation and training helped launch a research and planning process, engaging a cross section of Delaware's leadership in government, higher education, and child care. The result was a conceptual model, adopted in April 1990, and a ten-year implementation plan to fully establish and monitor all components of a comprehensive Career Development System. Implementation of the model will make Delaware the first state in the nation to have child care licensing and training systems that are fully integrated and coordinated.

Like the special education model, the Delaware case illustrates the benefits of expert consultation and technical assistance in helping states, communities, or institutions develop and implement effective models for improving training in early childhood care and education. Even when there is a commitment to "doing something," states and communities may need encouragement and technical assistance

at certain points in determining what to do and how to go about doing it. Developing a national technical assistance capacity for this purpose could be a powerful strategy for helping individual states and communities improve their systems for early childhood training and preparation.

CONCLUSION

The scattered and mostly small-scale efforts described here do not form the massive and systematic thrust that will be required to expand and improve the training and preparation system for early childhood personnel. But the creativity and commitment to quality that characterize these diverse strategies and initiatives show what can be done. The new emphasis on the importance of early childhood education by policymakers, the business sector, and parents creates a good opportunity for systematic action to improve program quality in the next decade.

#

Appendix A

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Helen Blank
Senior Program Associate
Children's Defense Fund

Susan Blank
Program Associate
Foundation for Child Development

Barbara Bowman
Dean of Graduate Programs
Erikson Institute for Child Development

Susan Bredekamp
Director of Professional Development
National Association for the Education of Young Children

Amanda Broun
Legislative Assistant
Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

Richard Clifford
Senior Investigator
The Carolina Institute for Child and Family Policy
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Karen Collins
Associate Director
Child Advocacy Office
National Council of Churches

Emily Fenichel
Associate Director
National Center for Clinical and Infant Programs

Lily Wong Fillmore
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Education, Language and Literacy Division
University of California, Berkeley

Ellen Galinsky
Co-President
Families and Work Institute

Sandra Hofferth
Senior Researcher
Human Resource Policy Center
Urban Institute

Wade Horn
Commissioner
Administration for Children, Youth and Families

Carollee Howes
Professor
School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Betty Hutchison
Dean
Human Services Institute
Chicago City-Wide College

Sharon Lynn Kagan
Associate Director
The Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy
Yale University

Lilian Katz
Professor of Early Childhood Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Illinois, Urbana

Jerry Kitzi
Director
Project Early
Ewing and Marion Kauffman Foundation

J. Ronald Lally
Director
Center for Child and Family Services
Far West Laboratory

Joan Lombardi
Consultant

Luba Lynch
Executive Director
A.L. Mailman Foundation

John MacDonald
Assistant Secretary
U.S. Department of Education

Shelby Miller
Program Officer
Ford Foundation

Anne W. Mitchell
Director
Center for Children, Families and Communities
Research Division
Bank Street College

Gwen Morgan
Project Director
Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education
Wheelock College

Carol Brunson Phillips
Executive Director
Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition

Gloria Rodriguez
Executive Director
Avance

Valora Washington
Program Director
Education and Youth
Kellogg Foundation

Vivian Weinstein
Consultant
Conrad Hilton Foundation

Kathryn Young
Senior Program Officer
Children and Families at Risk
Smith Richardson Foundation

Tony Ward
Executive Director
Child Care, Inc.

David Weikart
President
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation

Arthur Wise
President
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Caroline Zinsser
Consultant
Rockefeller Brothers Fund

Carnegie Corporation

David A. Hamburg
President

Vivien Stewart
Program Chair
Education and Healthy Development of Children and Youth

Michael H. Levine
Program Officer
Education and Healthy Development of Children and Youth

Carol Copple
Consultant

AGENDA

Carnegie Corporation of New York and Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Consultation on Preparation and Professional Development
Programs for Early Childhood Educators
November 7 and 8, 1990

Wednesday, November 7, 1990

1:00 p.m.	Welcome: David A. Hamburg, President, Carnegie Corporation
1:15 p.m.	Overview and Introduction of Participants: Michael Levine, Carnegie Corporation; Caroline Zinsser, Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Lynn Kagan, Yale University
1:45-3:45p.m.	First Discussion: Knowledge Base Issues (Lilian Katz, University of Illinois)
3:45 p.m.	Break
4:00-6:00 p.m.	Second Discussion: Delivery Systems (Barbara Bowman, Erikson Institute)
6:00 p.m.	Break to Grand Hyatt Hotel 42nd and Lexington Avenue
7:30 p.m.	Dinner at Grand Hyatt Hotel, Conference Level (Uris Room) Confirmed speakers: Wade Horn, Commissioner, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families; John MacDonald, Assistant Secretary, United States Department of Education

Thursday, November 8, 1990

9:00 a.m.	Continental Breakfast
9:30 a.m.	Recap and Overview of Day (Lynn Kagan)
10:00-12:00 p.m.	Third Discussion: Policy/Program Issues (David Weikart, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation)

AGENDA

Carnegie Corporation of New York and Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Consultation on Preparation and Professional Development
Programs for Early Childhood Educators
November 7 and 8, 1990

Thursday, November 8, 1990

12:00-1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:00-3:00 p.m.	Directions for the Field (Discussion leaders and Chairperson)
3:00-3:30 p.m.	Summary and Next Steps

Appendix B

RESOURCES FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD TRAINING PROGRAMS AND CURRICULA

The following are resources that may be useful in exploring available curricula for training early childhood staff:

The Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition. A subsidiary of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the council administers the Child Development Associate Credentialing Program and works to improve the professional status of early childhood workers. As part of this mission, it provides a variety of resources on training, including Resources for Early Childhood Training: An Annotated Bibliography (by Michele Porzel), which lists books, training manuals, modules and audiovisual materials by CDA functional areas and by setting (family day care, home visitor, infant/ toddler, preschool, and training support); Family Day Care Training Resources; and Resources for CDA Training. Available from the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, 1718 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., #500, Washington, DC 20009. (202) 265-9090 or 1-800-424-4310.

Teaching Strategies, Inc. This organization produces curriculum materials for teachers and caregivers, step-by-step training packages (based on the Child Development Associate (CDA) competencies) designed for in-service training of staff, and intensive seminars for center directors, education coordinators, and trainers on implementing the curriculum and training programs developed by Teaching Strategies. Materials are available from Teaching Strategies, Inc., 6407 32nd Street, N.W., P.O. Box 42243, Washington, D.C. 20015. (202) 362-7543.

Training Guide: Family-to-Family Child Care Initiative. This guide offers guidance in choosing training models and descriptions of five family day care training programs, each of which contains specific curricula, formats, activities, and step-by-step structures. The programs are located at the Texas Agricultural Extension Service, Iowa State University, the University of North Carolina, Brigham Young University, and the Fairfax (Virginia) Office for Children. Available from Mervyn's, Public Affairs Office, 25001 Industrial Boulevard, Hayward, CA 94545. (415) 788-7492.

High/Scope Training of Trainers Program. This on-site, curriculum-based inservice training program (thirty-five days of on-site training, in seven five-day sessions held over a ten-month period) is designed to prepare supervisory early childhood professionals to train teachers to work with young children in the High/Scope curriculum method. The widely used High/Scope model is a developmental, active learning approach involving both children and adults. For more information, contact Clay Shouse, Manager, Development and Services, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 600 North River Street, Ypsilanti, MI 48198. (313) 485-2000.

Training Programs for Family Child Care--A Descriptive Analysis, by K. Modigliani. This booklet reviews curricula for training family child care providers, noting the strengths of each curriculum and comparing the content, including how each addresses the CDA competencies and the areas assessed by the National Association for Family Day Care. Four comprehensive training curricula and three specialized curricula are reviews. Available through Mervyn's, Public Affairs Office, 25001 Industrial Boulevard, Hayward, CA 94545, and Target Stores, Community Affairs, 33 South Sixth Street, P.O. Box 1392, Minneapolis, MN 55440-1392. Quantities are limited.

The following are training resources for meeting special needs:

To train staff for infant/toddler programs:

The Program for Infant-Toddler Caregivers. A training system centering around a series of videos in English, Spanish and Chinese, each with an accompanying video magazine and set of curriculum guides. Caregiver guides also are available for purchase and videos for purchase or loan. The training system is available through the Center for Child and Family Studies (J. Ronald Lally, Director), Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. Videos and guides available through the California Department of Education, Bureau of Publications, Sales Unit, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 92802-0271.

Infant/Toddler Caregiving: An Annotated Guide to Media Training Materials. This organization provides a survey of videos, films, filmstrips, slide cassette programs, and audio programs that were developed to train caregivers of children under age three (as of 1986). 101 pp. Available from the California Department of Education, Bureau of Publications, Sales Unit, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95802-0271

To help staff working with homeless children:

A staff training curriculum on meeting the developmental needs of homeless and formerly homeless children currently is being field tested at sites in New York City. For more information contact Child Care, Inc., 275 Seventh Avenue, new York, NY 10001, (212) 929-7604.

To increase cultural sensitivity:

The Anti-Bias Curriculum by Louise Dermond-Sparks helps those working with young children recognize their own cultural biases and become more culturally sensitive to the children and families they serve. Available through Pacific Oak University, 714 West California Boulevard, Pasadena, California 91105, (818) 397-1300.

Appendix C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berrueta-Clement, J., Schweinhart, L., Barnett, W., Epstein, A., and Weikart, D. (1984). Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths Through Age 19. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.) (1987). Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young People.

Bredekamp, S. (1989). Regulating Child Care Quality: Evidence from NAEYC's Accreditation System. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Child Development Associate National Credentialing Program (1988). Child Development Associate Assessment System and Competency Standards: Preschool Caregivers in Center-Based Programs. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Committee on Economic Development (1987). Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged. New York, NY: Author

Elkind, D. (1988). "Current Reforms in Early Childhood Education: Are We Addressing the Issues?" Young Children, 43 (2), 27-32.

Elkind, D. (1988). "Early Childhood Education on Its Own Terms." In Early Schooling: The Great Debate, edited by S. Kagan and E. Zigler. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Galinsky, E. (1989). "The Cost of Not Providing Quality Early Childhood Programs." New Haven, CT: Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, Yale University.

Hofferth, S. and Phillips, D. (1987). "Child Care in the United States, 1970-1995." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 559-71.

Kisker, E., Hofferth, S., and Phillips, D. (1991). A Profile of Child Care Settings: Early Education and Care in 1990. Princeton, NJ: Mathematic Policy Research.

Lazar, I., and Darlington, R. (1980). Lasting Effects After Preschool: A Report of the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Morgan, G. (1987) The National State of Child Care Regulation 1986. Watertown, MA: Work/Family Directions.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (1982). Early Childhood Teacher Education Guidelines for Four- and Five-Year Programs. Washington, DC: Author.

National Center for Health Statistics (April 4, 1990). Births, Marriages, Divorces and Deaths for 1989: Monthly Vital Statistics Report, 38(12). Rockville, MD: U.S. Public Health Service.

Ott, D., Zeichner, K., and Price, G. (1990). "Research Horizons and the Quest for a Knowledge Base in Early Childhood Teacher Education." In Early Childhood Teacher Preparation: Yearbook in Early Childhood Education, 1, edited by B. Spodek and O. Saracho. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Phillips, D., McCartney, K., and Scarr, S. (1987). "Child Care Quality and Children's Social Development." Developmental Psychology, 23, 573-43.

Roupp, R., Travers, J., Glantz, F., and Coelen, C. (1979). Children at the Center--Final Report of the National Day Care Study. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Shinn, M., Phillips, D. Howes, C., Galinsky, E., and Whitebrook, M. (1990). Correspondence Between Mothers' Perceptions and Observer Ratings of Quality in Child Care Centers. New York, NY: The Families and Work Institute.

Whitebrook, M., Howes, C., and Phillips, D. (1990). Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America: Final Report of the National Child Care Staffing Study. Oakland, CA: Child Care Employee Project.

Appendix D

A PROFESSION GROWING UP: PAINTING OUR THINK

Sharon L. Kagan
Yale University
March, 1991

"It was Lisa's turn to paint at the easel. First she stood and thought for a minute and then, as if to reassure herself that she was capable of painting, she made this comment: 'I know painting is easy. First, you think your thoughts, and then you paint your think.'"

Listen! The Children Speak, 1979, p.49.

There is little doubt that the field of early care and education is "thinking its thoughts" regarding the professional development of its staff. At a critical juncture, the field recognizes that the issues discussed throughout this document pose tenacious and complex challenges. On the other hand, it also realizes that the conditions supporting changes are more promising than at any time in the history of the field. With child care and early education coalescing, with the field expanding and with significant increases in legislative dollars allocated to training, the time is ripe for the field to identify the issues for which it is responsible and to discern its role in crafting strategies for change. In short, it's time to paint our think.

SECTION I - THINKING OUR THOUGHTS: THE ISSUES

DEFINING KNOWLEDGE BASE NEEDS

In surveying the literature on professionalism, Katz (1986) suggests that among the defining attributes of any profession are requirements that entrants undergo prolonged training, and that professional institutions offering such training concur on a common core of knowledge (content) and techniques (strategies). Presumably, such consensus is predicated on unified vision and provides a degree of standardization

across the field.

Professionals in early care and education agree that quality training rooted in agreed-upon knowledge and techniques would be desirable. Indeed, the group goes further. It suggests that given the inadequacy and fragmentation of most training efforts and the expanding need for early care and education personnel, the time for such consensus and quality training is imminent.

Linking Developmental Theory and Curriculum Content

Despite the clarity of Katz's criteria and the urgency of need felt by meeting participants, a fundamental dilemma exists. The content of quality training for adults who work with young children is contingent upon three primary factors: 1) what we believe and know about how young children develop; 2) what we want children to know and be; and 3) practices that professionals feel facilitate knowledge and growth. Within the field of early care and education, no universal consensus exists on these issues.

By far, the most prevalent perspective is the one enunciated in the position statement, Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8 (Bredekamp, 1987). Developed over a three-year period with review and comment by hundreds of early childhood professionals, the work reflects a developmentalist perspective and recognizes that age appropriateness and individual appropriateness are linked dimensions of developmental appropriateness. Though never intended to be the sole source of curriculum, the document's focus on child development as one foundation for curriculum was well received—probably due to the explicitness and excellence of the document itself and to the fact that such a focus had long been ignored by curriculum and policymakers.

Despite its explication of philosophy and its precise delineation of appropriate and inappropriate practices, Developmentally Appropriate Practice has been criticized because it omits a focus on content; on "what children need to know." Spodek (1988a; 1988b) suggests that the position statement describes how to teach,

but does not provide sufficient guidance on what to teach. Moreover, in questioning developmental theory as the sole basis for pedagogy, he says, "What children need to know or ought to know is not determined by what children are capable of knowing (Spodek, 1989)." Suggestions about what children need to know, particularly for life in a democratic society, are emerging and helping move the field toward visions that integrate developmental theory and curriculum content. Clearly, the more the field can accomplish in this effort, the better the basis for extruding comprehensive training strategies.

Discerning Effective Instructional Strategies for Adults

Once philosophical and pedagogical domain are effectively linked, the field can more easily turn to the challenges of training diverse adult learners.

Teacher training in early care and education, except for the Child Development Associate credential, has conformed to fairly conventional norms of teacher education. In some cases, would-be teachers or caregivers attend courses, have opportunities for child observations and for some applied work, and perhaps engage in student teaching. In this model, theory and practice are integrated and workers have some field experience before assuming responsibilities for children. An equally prevalent scenario occurs when teachers or caregivers have little training or experience before working with children. In some cases, they may be exposed to regular in-service sessions or may be required to take courses or receive a CDA post-employment. In other cases, limited in-service training is available or used.

This mixed picture, coupled with the diversity of teachers/caregivers and the settings in which they work, suggests that training modalities will need to be diversified (Bowman, 1990). The challenge is to discern which modalities work best for which entrants under which conditions. How do we diversify training to suit individual differences? How do we assure appropriate balances between theoretical and applied work? What mechanisms can be created to make in-service training cumulative, thereby preserving its benefits? Inventive work on teaching teachers needs to be enhanced and applied in early care and education (Katz & Goffin, 1990;

Spodek & Saracho, 1990).

Finally, as we reassess teacher training strategies, we need to be sure that teachers are prepared to meet the needs of 21st century children and families. Helping early care and education personnel deal with the sequelae of generational poverty, pervasive substance abuse, and familial illiteracy and unemployment are essential prerequisites of effective training.

MODIFYING OUR MIND SET

As we work to fill gaps in the knowledge base, the field also needs to be inventive in its formulation of the challenge. We need to see the profession and its pedagogy holistically and we need to think children first, and curriculum and institutions second. As the following paragraphs suggest, we need to modify our mind set.

Envision the Profession and its Pedagogy Holistically

For decades, those in the field have espoused holistic approaches to serving young children, typically manifest as a commitment to meeting children's needs in physical, social, emotional, and cognitive domains. Most concur that this approach, rooted in developmental theory, has provided the theoretical glue that bound a disparate field together. Though highly adhesive in theory, the glue did not always stick in practice; social and emotional development were sometimes pushed aside in favor of intelligence quotient (I.Q.) gain. Developmental continuity, while accorded import in theory, was rarely implemented as children made transitions from one setting to the next.

Given a new social landscape characterized by very different preschool enrollments and family patterns, constructs that were implicit decades ago may need to be made explicit now. Pieces that were present theoretically need to be integrated practically. For example, while tacit endorsement of the importance of parents in child development has always existed, it is not a routine component of all early childhood/child development training. Expanding our mind set to think holistically, to include adult as well as child development, seems a necessary step to consider as

an increasing number of the field's services become adult-oriented. Similarly, while there has always been concern about the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse children, given increases in the numbers of such children in preschool programs and given advances in our knowledge about their learning, a more explicit commitment to language and cultural development as a core of our instructional knowledge base is needed.

In short, we must envision the professional practice of early care and education as inextricably linked to theory and pedagogy. Thinking and working holistically—be it integrating theory and practice, various dimensions of development, or family and programs—is the first responsibility of the profession.

Think Children, Not Programs

As knowledge base needs are met and as we begin to see the profession and its pedagogy holistically, we also need to modify our mind set so that the needs of children—not the requirements of various programs—form the core of our thinking. History suggests that this is more easily said than done; that the content of most early childhood professional preparation programs is only driven in part by professional knowledge or by child needs (Ott, Zeichner, & Price, 1990). The content of training programs is as heavily influenced by the demands of certification or regulation, which in turn is driven by the instructional auspices of various early childhood programs. Certification standards for teachers in public schools are considerably more stringent than those for providers in day-care centers or family day-care homes, though all may be serving children of exactly the same age. Indeed, the same four-year-old child could be placed in a classroom with a B.A.-level certified teacher or with someone who does not have a high school diploma. In many states, both are legal. State regulation—driven by the intended work setting—drives the amount and nature of training, not the needs of children and families or the professionally accepted knowledge base. The profession must lead the way in helping policymakers to realize that the needs of children transcend settings, making comparability of requirements for those who do comparable work with comparably aged children essential.

Differences in entry requirements among states have been documented among states; the field would do well to carefully assess discrepancies within the states as well.

By focusing on children's needs, entry requirements for those in comparable positions across institutional auspices will be homogenized. However, such a measure must not equate all positions of those who work with young children. Entry requirements must acknowledge that variation in child needs commands variation in training. Those who work with infants, while sharing basic developmental principles with those who work with older children, need specialized training in the care and nurturing of infants. Variation in training is not only driven by child age, but by chronic or acute needs, by conditions of families, and by differences that arise from place of birth, residence, or culture. Training must be sufficiently universal to assure equity and sufficiently flexible to accommodate child variation.

REDEFINING DEFINITIONS AND FRAMEWORKS OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Once our mind set about professional pedagogy is broadened to incorporate a holistic knowledge base and to focus on the needs of children, the profession needs to create broad frameworks to translate knowledge into practice. The frameworks below form the architectural infrastructure—the blueprints—that underpin delivery system and policy actions.

A Framework for Professional Development

While not always in complete agreement, meeting participants concurred that greater clarity in the amount of knowledge needed in each domain by individuals performing different tasks was essential. For example, we agree that the master teacher needs to know more than the teacher assistant, and that the teacher assistant needs to have different knowledge from that of the social services assistant or family worker. But beyond knowing that differences are necessary, the field has not precisely specified the elements of those differences.

Part of the reason such specificity has not occurred relates to the different

requirements and job titles attendant to the different systems in which early care and education take place. Rather than being reactive to idiosyncratic demands of state credentialing requirements, the field must be proactive, advocating what it knows is required to assure competence for various job levels and types of positions within the profession.

To that end, the field—in conjunction with NAEYC and its professional development efforts—must come to consensus regarding common nomenclature and common categories of professionals within the field. First, generic professional categories that transcend systems should be created. The field should agree upon the responsibilities it ascribes to family day-care workers, child development aides, child development assistants, child development associates (as distinct from the CDA program), child development teachers, and child development master teachers. Categories, perhaps not so numerous, for other job lines within the field (e.g., family workers, health professionals, and administrators) should be created, and responsibilities specified as well.

Once the responsibilities attendant to various job functions within each line are clarified, the profession should specify the knowledge levels needed in each domain to carry out the responsibilities. Such a professional development model inextricably links what child development personnel know with what child development personnel do.

Frameworks for Staffing

Once there is clarity regarding nomenclature, responsibilities, and requisite training for each job category, the next step is to aggregate the job categories to form inventive staffing patterns. Clearly, because early childhood settings vary, no single staffing pattern will fit all settings or institutions. The challenge is to develop an array of staffing patterns that can be adapted to multiple settings. In developing these staffing patterns, the profession must assure their flexibility, workability, and cost-effectiveness. Above all, the profession must safeguard quality, assuring that no staffing plan jeopardizes standards of appropriate pedagogy or child development

practice. Quality ratios and group sizes must be safeguarded. Such an endeavor must utilize the collective wisdom of people who know about child development and professional staffing and training issues. Moreover, creating inventive and effective staffing patterns must take market availability and finances into consideration.

ASSESSING AND STRENGTHENING THE DELIVERY SYSTEM

The data amassed at this meeting, in conjunction with the work done at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund meeting (1990), suggests that the delivery system for early childhood training is inadequate on many levels. First, with the down-sizing or elimination of early childhood training programs in the early-to-mid 1980s, there are insufficient training programs to meet the anticipated influx of new personnel. Second, the efficiency of the system is highly questionable. Chaotic and uncoordinated, the "system" is not a system at all, but an odd array of disparate efforts that force enrollees to take and retake courses. Third, access to training is inequitable at worst; inconvenient at best. Lacking scholarships for low-income individuals, many who might be interested in the field are driven away by inadequate support. Fourth, there are no incentives for institutions to collaborate. Few institutions comprehend the need for pedagogical integration across programs and schools on a single campus, much less the need for inter-campus coordination.

Despite the problems inherent in the existing delivery system, it is unlikely to be replaced entirely. Our best hope is to eliminate weaknesses and capitalize on strengths. To that end, we should discern who does what best and build institutional capacity.

Discerning Who Does What Best

Certainly, we can attribute some responsibility for the nation's fragmented training system to inadequacies in the knowledge base, to inconsistencies in requirements, and to a lack of clarity regarding professional levels. But we must also acknowledge as a contributing factor the ethos of institutional independence and survival. With little collective oversight and less incentive to coordinate training, two- and four-year

colleges, though they appear to serve discrete populations and attract very different faculty, often compete for both. With general diplomas, community outreach and evening courses, and the capacity to offer in-service credit, four-year institutions have attracted more diverse clientele, often in direct competition with two-year institutions. Moreover, with cutbacks in early childhood teacher training programs and an available pool of college instructors, two- and four-year colleges have often drawn their faculty from the same pool. Finally, four-year-colleges are often reluctant to accept credit for courses taken at the community college level, fostering acrimony between the two systems, and forcing students to not only repeat the content, but to pay twice for the same course, despite the fact that the content may be indistinguishable.

Such conditions render training redundant and fragmented, with institutions having little appreciation of either the burdens imposed by their lack of collaboration or the unique capacities of sister institutions. To make the system more efficient, the field needs to discern: 1) what elements of training are done best by which institutions under which conditions; 2) which training needs can be met through in-service and which can be met in preservice preparation. The field also needs to consider present and future roles that rich training delivery systems (such as Head Start and CDA) can play in the overall delivery of early care and education training.

Capacity Build: Using the Old-Creating the New

The early care and education field must assume leadership in this task, and indeed it may need to begin empowering groups or individuals to chronicle available options. Redding (1990) compiled a compendium of training options in Washington, D.C., and in so doing identified troublesome institutional gaps. The Connecticut Child Day Care Council (1990) developed a state plan of action after assessing its existing training capacity. Wheelock College, through its Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education, will review training efforts throughout the nation. With a compendium of models in hand, the field should consider stimulating the formation of statewide planning bodies to assess the state of training. It may well

be that this task could be incorporated into an already existing state body or collaboration. Whatever the structure, it is imperative that the status of training be assessed by early childhood leaders in the state. Such honest stock-taking across programs may be done by individuals or groups within the state, by formal or informal accreditation systems. Institutions offering baccalaureate degrees need to be assessed across departments because often early childhood training is offered by departments of human ecology, education, family studies, child development or home economics, among others. Moreover, since only about half the states offer specialized early childhood certification, many of the programs may be add-ons or sub-units of other programs, offering only limited early childhood training.

We need to better understand the content of the two-year college preparation programs to discern where there are overlaps with offerings at the four-year level. Further, we need to assess the linkages between associate degree granting institutions and more informal training efforts including in-service training. For example, the new CDA training and assessment will have dramatic impact on community colleges and may be an appropriate lever for reform. The concepts used in the extremely successful Center Accreditation Project of NAEYC might be an analogue for creating a voluntary accreditation effort with two-year teacher preparation institutions.

Beyond addressing systems and programs, the field must capacity-build those individuals in its academies. Save the tenure system, those teaching in teacher preparation programs function in isolation without benefit of rich collegial support or needed in-service training themselves. Without opportunities for invigorating in-service and professional development, we are limiting the capacity of the "inspirers of our next generation."

REVAMPING CERTIFICATION TO ACHIEVE QUALITY

The most exquisitely crafted system, characterized by enlightened teaching and learning, continuity of experiences, and ease of access would be felled and ultimately doomed unless it were accompanied by sanctions in the form of quality state certification requirements and monitoring.

In our roles as citizens of the society, we are all influenced by laws and mandates: we stop at red lights and pay taxes. We meet our societal obligations under the assumption that protections are offered in return—safe passage on our streets, effective waste removal. Getting a license to drive or a license to teach works the same way. We take the courses or jump over the necessary hurdles to get the certificate. And most do no more than the minimum, assuming that the minimum guarantees a modicum of safety, efficiency, or competence.

The dilemma in early care and education is that the protections do just that—assure a modicum of safety, efficiency or competence. The question America needs to ask is: "Where children are concerned, is this minimal standard enough?" As has been pointed out earlier, America, and indeed some within the field, assume that present regulations are sufficient. Data and the professional judgment do not support this view, but until public will changes, changes in certification are likely to be sporadic, at best.

Ultimately, the profession is responsible for lax certification standards throughout the nation. Not only are we responsible for them, but the profession, as well as the children served, are hurt by them. To that end, professional judgment and empirical data need to be amassed and reasonable certification standards developed to guarantee quality and consistency across systems. Such certification standards must recognize the different levels of training and experiences that are appropriate in the field and must safeguard entry for untrained individuals, with the full recognition that training would be made available to them.

Simultaneously, the field needs to embark on a public education program, exposing the liabilities to children from low or nonexistent certification standards. Legislators and other policymakers at the state and federal level must understand that early childhood quality is contingent upon a qualified workforce, and that provisions for credentialing and training must be a part of all legislation. Policymakers and the American public must be made aware of the high costs of low certification standards. The profession must put high energy into this historically low-priority issue.

CREATING INCENTIVES TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN QUALITY PERSONNEL

For decades, well-intentioned individuals, mostly women with limited employment options, subsidized the early care and education system because they were not offered adequate compensation and benefits. Such subsidization coupled with a marketplace economy has kept wages low and deterred many from entering the field, in the private or public sectors. To assure an adequate supply of child care and a sufficient entrant pool in the future, attention must be accorded: 1) salary and benefit incentives, generally; 2) salary and benefit incentives linked to training; and 3) incentives that make training more available and accessible.

While the lack of sufficient incentives has had rippling consequences historically, the dilemma is particularly oppressive at this point in time. Because today's women have career choices that afford higher salaries, they are marching away from early care and education as a profession, leaving the field with a chronic supply problem. Inadequate supply is doubly harmful: it limits the range and quality of potential entrants, and it suppresses the will to increase certification standards and calls for more extensive preservice training. Consequently, enhancing the working conditions and salaries of those in the field must be seen as a prerequisite to enhancing the quality and competence of the early childhood workforce. The field is acknowledging that being part of a noble profession is not sufficient inducement to enter the field.

The provision of general incentives, while a good first step, must be reinforced by making incentives for training more explicit. Presently, additional training is only occasionally linked to increased salaries, thereby diminishing the incentives for additional post-entry training. Particularly damaging, since entry requirements in many states are low or nonexistent, is the lack of linked benefits that diminishes incentives for those who need training most—untrained, entry-level workers. Enhanced training that leads to enhanced competence should be rewarded through salary increases, as is the case in other professions. Such incentives bolster the field in two ways: they help increase the pool of entrants, and they reduce the number of individuals who leave the field.

Third, training stipends and scholarships should be made available, as should

mechanisms that support trainees while they are in training, such as transportation, child care, and books. While important to all, these stipends and support are crucial for low-income workers.

To accomplish these ends, the field must determine the long-range costs of salary enhancements and the long-range costs of not providing them. Salary and benefit modelling using career ladders would be helpful so that the implications of various staffing options could be understood. Further, the field must develop and implement a long-range plan pivoting on policy. Mechanisms for funding basic salary enhancements, along with training incentives, must be sought. Federal and state legislation and programs need to be explored to ascertain potential vehicles for adding early childhood training supports. Student loan programs, the utilization of Pell grants, and FSA supports need to be more explicitly understood and locally operationalized. In short, training incentives can not be visioned separately from incentives for the field in general. They need to be part of a broader vision.

ENVISIONING A COHESIVE, EQUITABLE SYSTEM

The dilemmas of training in the field of early care and education appear very similar to fundamental dilemmas of early childhood service delivery: fragmentation, lack of equitable access, and quality. Is this similarity coincidental or is it bred of common circumstance?

Within a society ambivalent about the rightful role of government in child and family life, child care and early education has suffered, as have essential supports including monitoring of and training for service delivery. With federal commitment emerging primarily in times of national crises, child care and early education have never been regarded as an essential public service, yet—and perhaps as a consequence—the industry flourished in the private sector, underscoring its inherent value to the fee-paying public. Such historic bifurcation, abetted by episodic governmental involvement, left a field with divided interests and diminished assets. More than mere coincidence, common circumstances form the legacy of early childhood education and its training system.

Herein lies an important lesson. Assuming that fixing one leg of a broken stool will render the stool useful makes sense if other legs are intact; it is misguided if other legs are broken. Analogously, fixing training—one leg of the early childhood stool—will not fix the early care and education system because its other supports are splintered as well. To make a real difference, training must be considered an essential, but not the sole, component of early care and education reform.

This means that new training efforts for the field must be considered in light of other major changes—increasing involvement of the schools in early education, expansion of home-based and outreach programs, using Head Start as a hub of service delivery, expanding the role of child care to include family support, and using resource and referral programs in inventive ways. To be effective, training must be envisioned not only as a mechanism for nourishing teachers and providers, but as a means of uniting a badly fractured system. Recognizing training as a fulcrum of early care and education reform is more than appropriate: it is necessary.

PART II - PAINTING OUR THINK: ACTIONS FOR THE FIELD

As the Lisa vignette that opened this paper suggested, thinking our think is only the first step. We now turn to the task of painting our think.

Before actually putting brush to paper, several reflections on "our think" are in order. Regrettably, our work falls short in at least three important areas. First and paradoxically, the nascent efforts to improve training have fallen victim to precisely the situation they are trying to rectify. Lamenting fragmentation, we have done little to stem its perpetuation in our planning. We have no integrated vision of what the system should look like ideally. While the broad mission—the improvement of professional practice—is clear, more detailed goals and strategies are not. We have scattered projects and scattered ideas about what might be, but no integrated framework or plan. Moreover, even now, with concern justifiably high, the field has no mechanism or forum to create such a plan. In the absence of such, we stand prey to tinkering at the edges—to adopting piecemeal solutions—when breadth of thought

and comprehensiveness of vision are needed. In short, our snapshots of the problem must be augmented by a panorama of the solution.

Second, current efforts have been decidedly problem oriented, often failing to take stock of promising and potential efforts to address these challenges. As a field we have not pressed ourselves to better understand the programs, policies, or services that exist to overcome institutional fragmentation. Where are there examples of efficient training efforts and what can be learned about their comparative effectiveness? What is the potential of Head Start as a training delivery hub for early childhood? How are resource and referral programs augmenting training? Are they potential sources for training coordination and delivery? How can Family Support Act dollars be utilized to not only provide direct training, but to build the system? We have taken stock of the dilemmas, but not of the strengths or resources available to address them.

Finally, the profession has been speaking largely to itself, not learning from the experiences of other fields or gleaning support from key constituencies: parents, policymakers, union, or corporate leaders. Insufficient effort has been invested in making the public aware of the relationship between program quality or staff continuity and child outcome. Little effort has been expended on publicizing training dilemmas with an eye toward catalyzing broad-based support or action.

To move beyond protestations and piecemeal solutions, we need to paint our think broadly. The following picture, though only one of many that could be painted, has four broad brush strokes or components: 1) refining the vision; 2) assessing extant field efforts, institutional capacities and policies; 3) determining priorities and developing a strategic plan; and 4) creating public interest and will to support the implementation of the plan.

REFINING THE VISION

Leaders in early care and education must come together with others to envision an improved system of workforce recruitment and preparation for the field. It must grapple with solutions to the quality/quantity dilemma, the real necessity of training

coherence, and the appropriateness of extant approaches (e.g., special education, CDA) as models for expansion.

Moreover, visionary thinking demands that we not look at training in isolation, but consider it within the context of broader service delivery issues of the next century. Should we lodge the coordination and/or delivery of in-service training for the profession in one system (e.g., Head Start, the schools) and have this system act as a delivery hub? Should we consider more sustained incentives to attract people to the field? A TIAA-CREF model for pension? Should we consider a set of entirely new credentials that would transcend systems yet be germane to the entire field? Such essential issues warrant debate and consideration as major investments and realignments in training and service delivery are considered.

Stated simply, the field needs a vehicle to move beyond our conventional "finger in the dike" mechanisms. Like any field at a major crossroad, we need the opportunity to reflect, assess, and envision. To that end, a forum must be established where wise individuals can openly debate the issues and define new parameters for the training delivery system. This group would need the time, structure, and support to consider various alternatives. Moreover, it would need the freedom to be intellectually venturesome and the discipline to be realistic.

ASSESSING EXISTING FIELD EFFORTS, INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES, AND POLICIES

Such a vision cannot be crafted in the absence of reality. To that end, a systematic assessment of the current field efforts, institutional capacities, and policies must be undertaken. We have much of the information at hand; certainly, important steps to that end were launched at the Carnegie and Rockefeller meetings. But there are some important gaps. Building on excellent studies completed and on several in process, we need to ascertain demographic workforce conditions regarding supply and quality with particular emphasis on how recent legislation that expands early care and education affects these factors. Further, we need to codify our understanding of the relationship between training (in- and preservice) and performance. What kinds of

training make the difference for whom under what conditions? We also need to understand the array of innovative training efforts under way in the states, and to synthesize that practice knowledge so that it is useful in discerning what steps need to betaken next.

Beyond identifying individual efforts, we need to better understand institutional capabilities. What can we expect from Head Start training? Is it an elastic delivery system, suitable for expansion beyond Head Start staff? How could community college training more optimally intersect with existing CDA and Head Start efforts? What is the role of professional associations in promoting training? Which organizations are well-suited to mobilize training efforts?

Given that Head Start Reauthorization, the Family Support Act, and the Child Care and Development Block Grant all provide funds for training the early childhood workforce, attention must be accorded these legislative efforts. Discerning how funds can be used and how they can be coordinated to assure maximum utilization are important strategies to be assessed.

Taken together, the training picture is dense and complicated with multiple entry points and funding sources. Before the field can discern what should be done, such efforts should be mapped so that a complete picture of the intensity and scope of current efforts is clear.

One approach to mapping the state of the art is graphically portrayed in Figure 1. We could to use the issues discussed in the preceding section: 1)knowledge base; 2) professional practice models; 3) delivery system; 4) certification; 5) incentives and 6) vision, as major categories of activity. Should more specificity be necessary, the content areas could be crossed with domains of effort: 1) research; 2) practice; 3) public information/dissemination; and 4) advocacy/policy, to construct a twenty-cell grid. The grid could be used for several purposes: to map goals in each cell; to assess existing projects by cell, and to assess institutional and resource capacity by cell. Whether used at the national, state or local level, careful attention should be paid to existing institutional capacity and to consideration of the institutional capacities to be nourished. Finally, any such assessment would need to include an

analysis of potential resources: Who is interested in funding such efforts? In what amounts? Over what periods? How will expenditures and efforts be evaluated?

Figure 1

DOMAINS / ISSUES	Research	Practice	Info/Dis	Adv/Plcy
Knowledge Base				
Models of Professional Practice				
Institutional Delivery Systems				
Certification				
Incentives				
Vision				

DETERMINING PRIORITIES: DEVELOPING A PLAN

Once a vision is created and an assessment of the field is concluded, priority areas of emphasis need to be identified. Such priority-setting would consider the long-term vision and would assess the resources available and the resources needed to accomplish it. Priority setting would not impose action agendas on organizations or foundations, but would suggest priorities that could be considered as the field moves toward synchronized goals. It might opt for a balance of efforts among content areas and/or among activity domains or it might concentrate efforts in a limited number of areas. Priority determination would be done by a group and would embrace major workforce issues as well as direct training issues.

Using the priorities as guides, an action plan would be developed. It would identify specific goals, steps to be taken, resources needed, time lines, policy actions, and would specify ideal funding sequences and potential funders. It would map out

strategies that might focus on heavy investments in several key locales or states or a series of synergistic national efforts. The action plan would be a blueprint to guide a variety of training enhancement projects, but would not impose constraints on any organization.

The benefits of producing a nonbinding, comprehensive plan of action are multiple. First, organizations interested in supporting a training endeavor but unsure of where to intervene most effectively could be guided by the plan. Assessing the needs of the field in light of their organizational missions and priorities would enable them to discern whether or not involvement with the issue would be mutually productive. Second, rather than replicating various efforts without coordination, such a plan would enable the development of more useful projects. Third, policy construction and implementation take time. Armed with vision and timely data, a policy agenda could be sequenced. Finally, the nonbinding quality of the plan enables groups to be flexible and to retain autonomy over their efforts, while clearly realizing the degree to which they adhere and/or contribute to a national effort.

DEVELOPING PUBLIC INTEREST AND SUPPORT

Regardless of the breadth of vision or comprehensiveness of a plan, its implementation will falter unless constituent support is nurtured. Training in early care and education must come to be understood as the fulcrum upon which quality rests, and quality must be understood as essential to services for young children. Solid research evidence verifies the importance of quality teaching, yet the American public has not yet grasped the relationship between quality and outcome. To date, simply having services is sufficient.

Part of this training effort must affirm the intimate link between teacher training, teacher performance, and child outcome. To date, this message has not been understood. In part, this is because our message has not been explicitly clear and, in part, it is because we have not been strategic in identifying our messengers. At all steps, the effort must consider public education strategies and focus on nurturing the involvement of new constituencies. The process itself becomes part of the solution.

More explicitly, a dissemination strategy and the means to execute it must be built into the effort.

* * *

Julius Richmond and Milton Kotlechuck (1984) suggest that three conditions are necessary for social change: 1) the existence of a solid knowledge base; 2) political will; and 3) a social strategy. In the field of early care and education, we are long—though not complete—on the first and sadly short on the second and third. This effort, painting one picture of "our think," is explicitly aimed at guiding our energies and expertise to the mobilization of will and strategy, and at affirming that we can and must address the issue holistically.

REFERENCES

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.) (1987). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bowman, B. (1990). Issues in recruitment, selection and retention of early childhood teachers. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho (Eds.), Early childhood teacher preparation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Connecticut Child Day Care Council. (1990). Legislative position paper for quality child care services through education and training opportunities for Connecticut's child care providers. Hartford, CT: Author.

Katz, L. G. (1986). The nature of professions: Where is early childhood education? In L. G. Katz (Ed.), Professionalism, child development,and dissemination: Three papers. ERIC Clearinghouse.

Katz, L. & Goffin, S. (1990). Issues in the preparation of teachers of young children. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho (Eds.), Early childhood teacher preparation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ott, D. J., Zeichner, K. M., & Price, G. G. (1990). Research horizons and the quest for a knowledge base in early childhood teacher education. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho (Eds.), Early childhood teacher preparation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Redding, S. M. (1990). D.C. training opportunities. Washington, DC: Office of Early Childhood Development, Commission on Social Services, Department of Human Services.

Richmond, J. & Kotelchuck, M. (1984). Commentary on changed lives. In J. R. Berrueta-Clement, L. Schweinhart, W. Barnett, A. Epstein, & D. Weikart (Eds.), Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths through Age 19. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund. (1990). A quest for coherence in the training of early care and education teachers: Report of the June 20, 1990 Meeting. New York: Author

Spodek, B. (1988a). Conceptualizing today's kindergarten curriculum. The Elementary School Journal, 82(2), 203-211.

Spodek, B. (1988b). Early childhood curriculum and the definition of knowledge. Paper presented at the 1988 conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Spodek, B. (1989). What should we teach kindergarten children? (Cassette Recording NO. 612-89121). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Spodek, B. & Saracho, O. (1990). Preparing early childhood teachers for the twenty-first century: A look to the future. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho (Eds.), Early childhood teacher preparation. New York: Teachers College Press.

World Organization for Early Childhood Education, United States National Committee. (1979). Listen! The children speak: Anecdotes with interpretations. Washington, DC: Author.

Appendix E

FINANCING ISSUES IN THE PREPARATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY CHILDHOOD WORKFORCE

Joan Lombardi
Early Childhood and
Public Policy Specialist

At a time of tremendous expansion of early childhood services, we are faced with a shortage of available funds to train the necessary workforce, particularly outside of the Head Start community. Yet, a review of the recent early childhood research and policy literature indicates that the financing of early childhood preparation and professional development has received relatively limited attention. This paper is therefore an initial attempt to begin to define the issues and to capture some of what we do know about the financing of professional preparation. This discussion will focus on three questions:

- Why is the financing of preparation and professional development so important to this particular workforce?
- What do we know about current costs and expenditures for early childhood training?
- What should be included in a research and policy agenda regarding financing issues?

Why is the financing of preparation and professional development so important to this particular workforce?

Following two decades of unprecedented demand for early childhood services, the passage of landmark child care legislation and sizeable increases in Head Start brings us to the dawn of a second wave of program expansion. At the same time, we have become increasingly aware of the importance of a trained and stable workforce, and yet continue to experience high turnover and severe shortages of well-qualified staff. Unfortunately, the lack of adequate resources for professional development affects

both the supply and quality of early childhood training as well as the ability of providers and programs to access good training even when it is available.

Furthermore, there are very few other incentives to encourage providers to pursue professional preparation. For example, according to a recent report by The Children's Defense Fund (Adams, 1990), thirty-five states require no training whatsoever for family child care providers and thirty-two states do not require specific levels of formal training before teachers are hired in child care centers. Without requirements, decisionmakers at both the program and policy level may be less than willing to provide funds for training.

Inadequate salaries and the lack of a career ladder may discourage providers from voluntarily investing in their own professional development. According to the National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook, Howes, Phillips, 1989), although teachers with a B.A. degree did earn approximately one dollar an hour more than teachers with some college ($6.53 per hour compared to $5.56 per hour), this amount would not cover the cost of acquiring that education. The GAO study of high-quality programs (1989), reported that wages in NAEYC accredited centers did rise with education and experience. However, each year of education increased wages by only 6 percent.

Similarly, the National CDA Survey conducted by the Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition (1988), indicated that although 52% of the CDA's received a salary increase as a direct result of having earned the credential, these increases were minimal (43% received less than $100 and only 20% received increases over $500 per year). Moreover, although at least eight states have taken steps to improve salaries through budget or legislative action (Whitebook, Pemberton, Lombardi and Galinsky, 1990), relatively few of these efforts have resulted in significant or continued salary improvements and/or have been linked to an established career ladder.

<u>What do we know about costs and expenditures for early childhood training?</u>

There is very little, if any, systematic information on either the current costs or

expenditures of early childhood training. Although we have anecdotal information on isolated training costs, to develop a true picture of costs at either the individual program level or in the aggregate, we would need to define what we mean by training costs. For example:

- Which costs are we referring to? The total cost of delivery, tuition assistance only, release time for work, resources to support the training system?
- Who is to be trained? Supervisors (directors and education coordinations), teachers/family day care providers, teaching staff, or all staff?
- What quality provisions should be included in the costs of training?

Despite the lack of such comprehensive data, consideration of the following brief examples of costs can be instructive in beginning to formulate an overall sense of need.

According to Carol Phillips, the 1988 Survey of Training Provided by Post Secondary Institutions, conducted by the Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition, indicated that the cost of a certificate in early childhood ranged from $800-$1033 (specific costs paid for by the trainees themselves and those covered by scholarship aid were not available). The average number of credits in the certificate programs was 35, with the median cost per credit at $25 and the mean cost at $37 per credit. The cost of an associates degree ranged from $1840-$2827. The average number of credits in the two-year-degree programs was sixty-five, with the median cost per credit at $18 and the mean cost at $49 per credit. Phillips indicated that the rough estimate for implementing the new council model for CDA is $1500. This is designed to cover the cost of operation plus payment to the seminar instructor, advisor, and CDA Representative (Phillips, 1990).

Given that California has had a more extensive system of support for early childhood training than most states, it is also illustrative to consider their costs. The following figures were prepared by Peyton Nattinger (1990), an instructor in the California Community College system: (Note: trainee costs are tuition only, does not

include books, housing, food, transportation, etc).

State licensing (12 units)	- Public costs	$ 1,053
	- Trainee costs	63
Certificate (20 units)	- Public costs	$ 2,281
	- Trainee costs	105
Children's Center Permit (40 units)	- Public costs	$ 3,840
	- Trainee costs	200
AA Degrees (60 units)	- Public costs	$ 5,731
	- Trainee Costs	200

Finally, several early childhood programs (in combination with private sources) have moved to invest training dollars in the trainer, who will then in turn supervise and/or provide training directly to several teaching staff. This model has been used extensively by The High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. According to Larry Schweinhart, Chairman of the Research Division, the cost of High/Scope training of trainers is approximately $6000 per individual certified as a trainer. (Schweinhart, 1990)

Although we could collect several other examples of program costs, the data on training expenditures is less readily available. A cursory review of information regarding expenditures for early childhood training at the federal, state, and program level, as well as by the private sector, revealed the following:

In its publication, Funding for Child Care Training: A Federal Yellow Pages, The Child Welfare League (Durbin, Kopp and Toland, 1990), lists some thirty-three federal sources that may be utilized for child care training. These include programs that focus on job training, nutrition education, literacy, bilingual programs, child abuse prevention and many other topics. However, several sources listed target funds for specific projects such as the Comprehensive Child Development Programs, and would therefore not provide training funds outside their specific projects.

In fact there appears to be only about six "often cited" federal sources of training funds available for the larger child care community. These include funds from: The Social Services Block Grant, The Dependent Care Planning and Development Block Grant, The Child Care Food Program, The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Pell Grants, and the CDA Scholarship Act. In addition, funds from the Family Support Act are also beginning to be used as a source for training early childhood providers.

In a recent survey of the states, The Children's Defense Funds (Adams, 1990), found that states reported spending only a little over one million dollars from federal sources on child care training. The most common federal funding sources for training were the CDA Scholarship Program, the Dependent Care Block Grant, and the Social Services Block Grant. Although this clearly indicates an extremely small amount of federal funds for training, we should view this figure with some caution. Since those responding to the survey may have come from only one type of state agency (i.e., Social Services), and several other federal sources, such as the food programs and job training, were probably not considered. Furthermore, accurate totals for the use of such funds as JTPA and Pell grants for early childhood training do not appear readily available.

Despite these limitations, the figure of one million dollars for child care training is particularly alarming given the lack of immediate prospects for significant new federal training dollars. The new Child Care and Development Block Grant includes a $732 million appropriation for the first year. Twenty-five percent of the total allotment is set aside for quality improvements and for grants and contracts for early childhood/latchkey services. However, most of this is earmarked for the early childhood/latchkey services (no less than 75 percent of the set aside). This means that only 20-25 percent of the set aside is specifically targeted for quality. Furthermore, training is only one of six allowable uses for these funds, competing against such big ticket items as salaries, resource and referral, and licensing enforcement. Even if we assume that a third of the earmarked quality funds would be used for training, this would only provide some $12.5-15.6 million for training for all

fifty states.

Outside of this set aside, it appears that the bulk of the total allotment will be used for direct service. However, the legislation does say that funds can be used for activities to improve the affordability, availability, and quality of child care, and to expand the range of choices of child care services available to parents. Therefore, states may have some discretion on how the main portion of the money is spent. This would mean that a state could also use a part of the "non-earmarked" money for quality improvements. Unfortunately, because many states are facing such severe shortages of child care subsidy funds, particularly in light of demands made by the JOBS program, it may be difficult for training and other quality improvement initiatives to compete with the needs for direct service dollars.

The CDA Scholarship Act is another potential source of training money. In fact, this fund is the only source of federal dollars whose sole purpose is the improvement of the early childhood workforce. Although the Scholarship Act has been expanded, it is still extremely limited. The Scholarship Act was first passed as part of Title VI of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986. At that time it was authorized to provide one million dollars to the states for scholarships to cover the cost of CDA credentialing ($325 for assessment but not training). The recent reauthorization has expanded the eligibility criteria and allows the use of 35 percent of the money for training. Authorization levels are now at $3 million, however only about $1.4 million was appropriated in 1991.

In addition to the CDA Scholarship Fund, there is currently $13 million available to the states in the Title IV-A Child Care Licensing, Monitoring and Improvement Grants program. In 1991, states must use at least 50 percent of these funds for training child care providers. The fund is authorized at $50 million for 1992; however the administration's budget did not include an increase to this level for 1992 and further action by the appropriation committees is still pending.

Clearly the largest expenditure of federal funds for early childhood training is provided to Head Start programs. In fiscal year 1990, the federal government spent $30.6 million dollars on Head Start training and technical assistance (U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services, 1990). Although this is a significant amount compared to funds available to the general child care community, in fact a portion of this money is used for technical assistance in general and more specifically for technical assistance for services to handicapped children. Furthermore, at this time it is not clear how many of these funds are actually used for teacher training, although a study of this issue is currently under way. Moreover, given the pressing demands on Head Start services, programs have found that the current funding level has not been adequate to meet their training needs. According to the National Head Start Association (NHSA, 1990), as a percentage of total budget, Head Start training funds have decreased since 1974.

Fortunately for Head Start programs, the recent reauthorization will allow 2 percent of the budget to be used for training. If we assume a total Head Start budget of approximately two billion dollars, this will provide some $40 million for training and technical assistance. In addition, the legislation has 10 percent set aside for quality. At least half of this amount must be used for salary increases, with the remaining amount available for a wide variety of quality issues including training (Bolce, 1990).

Finally, with regard to federal funds, the military provides funds for training child care personnel. Again, although total expenditures across all military programs are not easily identified, information is available on the types of activities supported. For example, according to Beverly Schmalzried, Chief of Community Activities Policy, U.S. Air Force, appropriated funds (tax dollars) are made available to pay a training and curriculum specialist at the GS 7-9 level (on the average one specialist is provided to every 150-300 children in military programs or about one trainer to every thirty staff members). In addition, parent fees are used to pay for one hour per week of training for caregivers and teachers and other funds are available for tuition assistance (Schmalzried, 1990).

Before leaving the discussion of federal funds, it should be noted that those programs funded by the Higher Education Act (Pell Grants, supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, work/study, Guaranteed Student Loans, and Perkins

Loans) provided over $18 billion of student aide in academic year 1990-91 to help nearly six million students meet the costs of post-secondary education (Schenet, 1990). Although many of these programs require that a recipient be a full time student, the Higher Education Act does appear to be an important potential source for early childhood training.

At the state level, again there is a lack of comprehensive information. In the CDF state survey (Adams, 1990), states reported spending some $7 million of state money on training. Seven states made no formal efforts to pay for training. Another ten states described their efforts as "technical assistance," but their activities were limited and often unrelated to training. Five states said they provided some training, but were unable to specify the level or type of training provided. The remaining twenty-nine states funded specific training efforts. A majority (seventeen out of twenty-nine) spent between $100,000 and $400,000.

States spend their training funds in a variety of ways. For example, some spend it on making training more accessible (mobile libraries, teleconferencing, videos, etc.), others use it to train on special issues (child abuse, special needs, pediatric aides), and still others use it to train welfare parents for positions in child care. At least four states have established specific scholarship or loan forgiveness programs for child care providers (although clearly different, the terms scholarship and loan are often confused in state legislation). Minnesota provides scholarships for family child care providers to receive a CDA (or centers to go through accreditation). Maine provides some $30,000 in scholarships for people in the field who are pursuing two- and four-year degrees. Maryland and Virginia have both established loan forgiveness programs for early childhood staff. In addition, a loan forgiveness program recently passed both houses of the California legislature but was vetoed by the governor (Whitebook, Pemberton, Lombardi, and Galinsky, 1990).

Moving from the state to the program level, we are again faced with a lack of available information on training expenditures. Neither the National Child Care Staffing Study nor the General Accounting Office report (1990) provides information on how much programs spend on training. The American Society for Training and

Development (1990) states that in 1984, American businesses spent an average of 1.4 percent of payroll on formal training. (ASTD recommends 2 percent of payroll). The total average spent per employee in the U.S. on training was $283. Given the costs reviewed earlier, and the need for basic entry level training in the early childhood field, this amount would cover only a fraction of training costs.

Finally, there appear to be increasing private investments in early childhood training. Private foundations, at the national and community level, have supported a wide range of training and other initiatives that are focused on the early childhood workforce. In addition, the growing corporate interest in child care is finally beginning to address the quality issues (Galinsky, in press). In its publication on public-private partnerships for child care, the Child Care Action Campaign (Euban and Reisman, 1990) listed several examples of private sector support for training for both center-based and family child care providers throughout the country.

What should be included in a research and policy agenda regarding financing issues? The issues surrounding the financing of early childhood training need a much more exhaustive review. The following research questions were developed at a recent "Qualified Workforce Meeting" convened by The Child Care Employee Project (1990):

1. Availability of funds. What sources of funding currently exist at the federal, state and local level? How are these funds distributed? How are funds being spent across program types and across roles within programs (administrators, teachers, family child care)?

2. Cost effectiveness. What are the advantages and disadvantages of various elements of the training system (content; methodology; distribution of funds to training institutions, versus to programs or individual providers, through grants or loans, etc?) How should funds be targeted? What are the implications of staff turnover for cost effectiveness?

3. Comparative information. How does the early childhood field compare with other "industries" with regard to training and financing capacity? What can we learn from other countries with regard to the financing of early childhood

professional preparation?

4. Vision. Can we map out what training should cost at the program level and who should bear what costs? What are the policy implications for this vision?

As we gather further information on this issue, the critical needs of the early childhood community call for more immediate action to affect policies which will expand the financing of preparation and professional development. The following principles should be considered in the formulation of new policies:

- While training funds should come from a variety of sources, the federal government should play a leadership role to ensure a qualified workforce.
- There should be equitable distribution of public funds for training across early childhood program types, particularly for those programs that serve low-income children.
- New funds should be spent on high quality training and on the promotion of a career ladder.
- Policies to expand training opportunities should be accompanied by corresponding efforts to improve compensation and parental recognition of quality services.
- Providers should not have to spend a disproportionate amount of their salaries on training, particularly given the lack of financial incentives provided once they are trained.
- Programs should receive support to help pay for training costs, particularly when they are mandated to meet staffing requirements.

The following strategies could be used to move the policy agenda forward:

- Expand the Higher Education Act and other appropriate federal legislation to encourage more early childhood training.
- Fully fund the CDA Scholarship Program and The Title IV A Child Care Licensing- Monitoring and Improvement Grants.
- Disseminate information across states regarding legislative models for financing training, career ladders, compensation and parental recognition of quality.
- Provide incentives and technical assistance for states to establish coordinated early childhood training plans.
- Promote private sector investments in the early childhood workforce through the establishment of community and/or state quality improvement funds.

- Launch a public awareness campaign on the importance of qualified staff in early childhood programs.

These efforts will need to be supported through technical assistance to states as well as assistance to those people (and groups) in the field who are working to change federal and state policy.

REFERENCES

Adams, Gina (1990). Who Knows How Safe? The Status of State Efforts to Ensure Quality Child Care. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

American Society for Training and Development (1990). Fact Sheets: "Amount Spent on Training by American Businesses" and "Highlights of Recommendations from Training America". Alexandria, Virginia: author.

Bolce, Don, Director, Government Affairs, The National Head Start Association, Personal Communication, October 22, 1990.

Child Care Employee Project (1990). Unpublished proceedings from the small group session on "financing" at the "Qualified Workforce Meeting" held on October 12-13, 1990, Berkeley, California.

Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition (1988). "The 1988 CDA National Survey Results", unpublished manuscript, Washington, D.C.: author.

Durbin, E., Kopp, M. & Toland, N. (1990). Funding for Child Care: A Federal Yellow Pages, Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League.

Euban D. and Reisman, B., (1990). Making the Connections: Public-Private Partnerships in Child Care, New York: Child Care Action Campaign.

Galinsky, E. (in press). "The Private Sector as a Partner in Early Care and Education", in The National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Sharon L. Kagan, Editor.

Nattinger, Peyton (1990), "The Economic Implications of ECE Preparation in the Community Colleges", an unpublished paper presented at the "The Qualified Workforce Meeting", Berkeley, California, October 12-13, 1990.

National Head Start Association, Head Start: A Nation's Pride, A Nation's Challenge, Alexandria, Virginia: author.

Phillips, Carol, Executive Director, Council on Early Childhood Professional Recognition, personal communication, October 19, 1990.

Report on Preschool Programs, October 10, 1990, "Program Links Salary Increases with Child Care Training". Silver Spring, Maryland: author.

Schmalzried, Beverly, Chief, Community Activities Policy, U.S. Air Force, personal

communication, October 18, 1990.

Schweinhart, Lawrence, Chairman, Research Division, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, personal communication, October 19, 1990.

Schenet, Margot (1990). CRS Issue Brief: Higher Eduction: Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C. & Phillips, D. (1989). Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America. Oakland, California: Child Care Employee Project.

Whitebook, M., Pemberton, C., Lombardi, J., & Galinsky, E., (1990). From the Floor: Raising Child Care Salaries, Oakland, California: Child Care Employee Project.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1990). "Project Head Start Statistical Fact Sheet. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. General Accounting Office (1990). Early Childhood Education: What are the Costs of High Quality Program? Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

This paper was prepared for the consultation on Preparation and Professional Development Programs for Early Childhood Educators: Emerging Needs for the Next Decade, co-sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York City, November 7-8, 1990. Joan Lombardi has served as a consultant to several national organizations including: The National Head Start Association, The Head Start Bureau, The Child Care Employee Project and The National Association of State Boards of Education. She is a current member of the NAEYC Governing Board.